



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/416,516	10/08/1999	SUSAN R. SALL	450.268US1	6265

24333 7590 07/27/2004

GATEWAY, INC.
ATTN: SCOTT CHARLES RICHARDSON
610 GATEWAY DRIVE
MAIL DROP Y-04
N. SIOUX CITY, SD 57049

EXAMINER

LEWIS, DAVID LEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2673

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2004

22

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/416,516

Applicant(s)

SALL, SUSAN R.

Examiner

David L Lewis

Art Unit

2673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. **Claims 1, 2, 6, 11, 23, 24, 27, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler et al. ((6302612 B1) in view of Gouko (6222507 B1).**

2. **As in claims 1, 23, and 33, Fowler et al. teaches of a display comprising: a primary display device for a computer for displaying a primary set of information from an application running on the computer, figure 9 item 110, column 4 lines 4-6; and at least one secondary display device for the computer, the at least one secondary display device operatively coupled to the computer and stored in a housing adjacent to the primary display device, such that the at least one secondary display device can be extended from the housing and used to display the secondary information from the application, figure 10 item 111, column 4 lines 7-16, upon the extension of the secondary display device to increase a viewing area of the primary display device for the primary information, column 1 lines 37-40, column 4 lines 4-35, wherein Flowers teaches of both a convention and extended mode of operation. However Flowers is silent as to said distinction between a primary and secondary set of information. Gouko provides for a display with the same purpose of Fowlers, to extend the display area, figure 2. Gouko teaches of display information being displayed in divided portions of a single display in a conventional display, his improvement being capable of dividing the same displayed information among two or more displays, column 5 lines 29-61. Wherein as claimed the primary display having a first and second set of information converts to the primary display with a first set of information and a secondary display extended from the primary display, with a secondary set of information. Therefore Fowler teaches of going from a first convention mode to a second extended mode, and Gouko teaches how the information is changed in the extended mode. The features of Fowler and Gouko are adaptable to each others invention because they solve the same problem of increasing display area and suggest extending a second display to do it.**

Art Unit: 2673

Therefore it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention to combine the features of Fowler and Gouko because they both teach of alternative structures for increasing display area by extending a second display from the housing of a first display, to display a plurality of images as known in the art. **Further, as amended, Gouko teaches** wherein the primary display for the primary set of information is increased, column 5 lines 54-55, wherein data can be enlarged by the sub panels, and therefore the primary display for the primary set of information is increased based on said enlargement. Gouko states an image displayed therein can become larger in size, column 5 lines 40-50.

3. **Claims 13, 16, 17, 21, 34, 39, 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler et al. ((6302612 B1) in view of Gouko (6222507 B1), Rebeske et al. (6295038 B1), and Haneda et al. (5900848).**

4. **As in claims 13, 34, and 41, Fowler et al.** in view of Gouko et al., teaches of the invention as applied to claims 1, 23, and 33. **However they are silent as to said automatic feature** wherein the secondary set of information is displayed automatically upon extension of the secondary display device. **Rebeske teaches the secondary display device, figure 4,** as taught by Fowler, can be easily provided with a control switch, either through the utilization of a hardware switch or through software programming, wherein the second display screen can be turned off to permit the laptop computer to be used in the conventional manner similar to laptop computers having the conventional single screen. **Haneda et al.** teaches an automatic detection mechanism and display reconfiguration when the computer is placed in its double screen mode, **figure 3, 9, 10, column 2 lines 20-45. Therefore given the purpose of Fowler and Gouko is to extend the primary display area by extending a secondary display, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan** at the time of the invention to accomplish this objective by known electro-mechanical control and software reconfiguration methods as taught by Rebeske and Haneda, because they suggest a means to accomplish displaying information on a first and second display as claimed and taught by Fowler and Gouko. **Further, as amended, Gouko teaches** wherein the primary display for the primary set of information is increased, column 5 lines 54-55, wherein data can be enlarged by the sub panels, and therefore the primary display for the primary set of information is increased based on said enlargement. Gouko states an image displayed therein can become larger in size, column 5 lines 40-50.

5. **Claims 22, 25, 26, 30, 31, 32, and 35, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler et al. ((6302612 B1) in view of Gouko (6222507 B1), Rebeske et al. (6295038 B1), Haneda et al. (5900848), and Hendry et al. (5682529).**

Art Unit: 2673

6. **As in claims 22 and 30-32, Hendry et al.** further teaches of said reconfiguration module in support of the automatic reconfiguration taught by Haneda et al. Hendry et al. teaches of a reconfiguration module, figure 1 item 22, wherein the display manager within the operating system provides communication between each of the software or hardware components, to dynamically configure the plurality of display devices, column 3 lines 29-67, column 5 lines 55-67, column 6 lines 1-13. Further wherein Hendry et al. teaches this reconfiguration may occur automatically as a result of detecting the connection or disconnection of a device from the computer, for example upon insertion into or removal from a docking station, or the pivoting of a monitor from a portrait position to a landscape position. An example of a structure for a display notification is illustrated in Hendry et al.'s figure 3, wherein upon the rearrangement of the display system as taught by Rebeske, said notification would be shown to the user for input and or notice of said reconfiguration. Rebeske clearly teaches of a display devices within the scope of the invention as suggested by Hendry et al. **Therefore it would have been obvious** to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention to modify the computer display device as taught above by Rebeske by utilizing the display manager connected to computer hardware aspects of the device as a reconfiguration module by including software as suggested by Hendry et al. and Haneda et al. to reconfigure the display systems upon extending a display from the housing for purposes of expanding the display view as taught by **Fowler and Gouko**, because Hendry et al. and Haneda et al. suggests the need for said reconfiguration in a computer display system with one or more display devices, as found in claims 22, and 30-32. **As amended, Gouko further teaches** wherein the primary display for the primary set of information is increased, column 5 lines 54-55, wherein data can be enlarged by the sub panels, and therefore the primary display for the primary set of information is increased based on said enlargement. **Claims 25, 26, 38**, would have been obvious to the skilled artisan for the same reasons of obviousness as applied to the above claims. **As in claims 25 and 26**, Haneda et al. and Hendry teach of said reconfiguration, figure 1 and figure 1. **As in claim 35**, Gouko teaches of wherein the secondary information comprises tools for the application, column 5 lines 12-23 and 49-55, wherein a know said computer desktop work area comprises icons or menus for the respective application. **As in claim 38**, said reconfiguration feature would have been obvious for the reasons of obviousness as applied to 22, given said feature is automatic, a relation restart would be unnecessary.

7. **Claims 3-5, 7-10, 14, 15, 18-20, 2,8, 36 and 37, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler et al. ((6302612 B1) in view of Gouko (6222507 B1), Rebeske et al. (6295038 B1), Haneda et al. (5900848), Hendry et al. (5682529), and Failla (5128662).**

Art Unit: 2673

8. **As in claims 3-5, 7-10, 14, 15, 18-20, and 28**, Folwer et al. teaches of the devices as applied above to claims 1, 13, 23 and 34. However they are silent as to the specifics of said spring loaded switching, cable connection, and inverter board features. Said features however represent well known display housing interfacing components for connecting segmented displays and would have been an obvious design choice in the implementation of the device as taught by Fowler et al.. Failla teaches of a similar segmented display for a computer wherein spring loaded switching, ribbon cable connection, and inverter board features are utilized to implement the system display, column 8 lines 40-60, figures 7, 13, 17. Each of said features would have been obvious to the skilled artisan given their well known use in the art for the implementation of such displays as suggested by Fowler et al. and Failla, as found in claims 3-5, 14, 15, and claims 7-10, 18-20, and 28. **As in claims 36 and 37**, Fowler et al. fails to teach of said spring loaded switch providing a conductive path for a reconfiguration signal the secondary display, however any know mechanism for making the device feature operable wherein the secondary display is extended from behind the primary display would have been obvious design choice to the skilled artisan. Said conductive path and reconfiguration arc inherent the device of Fowler and Gouko. Said spring load switch feature represents a known display housing interfacing component for connecting segmented displays and would have been an obvious design choice in the implementation of the device as taught by Gouko. Failla teaches of a similar segmented display for a computer wherein spring loaded switching, ribbon cable connection, and inverter board features are utilized to implement the system display, column 8 lines 40-60, figures 7, 13, 17. Therefore the spring loaded switch of Failla would have been an obvious design choice for implementing the device as taught by Fowler et al. and Gouko given said features are know for use in connecting component segmented display, as found in claims 36 and 37.

9. For the corresponding relation to claims above: **As in claim 2**, Fowler teaches of, wherein the at least one secondary display device is operatively coupled to the primary display device, figure 9-11. **As in claim 6, 16, 27, and 39** Gouko teaches of, wherein the at least one secondary display device is extended from a side of the housing, figure 2. **As in claims 11, 17, 21, 29, and 40**, Gouko teaches of extending from the sides and top, figure 6, column 5 lines 1-5, Fowler, figure 2 and 10. **As in claim 12**, Gouko teaches of, further comprising at least one hinge coupling the at least one secondary display device to the housing, figure 3. **As in claim 24**, Fowler teaches of, further comprising storing the at least one secondary display device behind the housing for the primary device, figures 911.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed on 5/5/2004 with respect to claims 1-41 have been considered but are not persuasive. Gouko on column 5 lines 30-60 teaches of displaying a plurality of images on a first display area and then displaying a plurality of images on multiple display areas, such that the display area for said data can be enlarged. Wherein said plurality of images can be represented by a first and second display information that is first shown on a first display and is next shown simultaneously first information on the first display and second information on the second display, so that the image can be enlarged, wherein the effect is as claimed wherein the primary display for the primary set of information is increased. Further Rebeske alternatively reads on the applicants invention such that a first screen 64 shows a first and second information, said first primary information being the tool menu selection data, and when the second display is extended the second display information is shown on the second display 70 and the first display, as shown in figure 4, the total viewing area being generally enlarged by having an extended display, and in line with usual desktop functions capable of enlargement. Fowler combined with Gouko teaches of the applicants invention wherein as with Gouko, Fowler also teaches of extending a second display to enlarge the image being displayed. While Fowler or Gouko may not give explicit detail about their software implementation the conceptual idea based on their specification and illustrations however are sufficient to show inherency within the four corners of their teaching. For example both Gouko and Fowler teaches of a first and second display, and therefore inherently also teach of a first and second display information. The Applicant argues neither Fowler or Gouko describe reconfiguring their display devices upon extensions however said feature is inherent to the concept of enlarging the display area or image of display. As discussed above, Gouko teaches of displaying a plurality of images on independent screens and extending additional screens from behind a main screen to display said plurality of images, therefore reconfiguration software would be necessary based the structural design as taught by Gouko and Fowler. Rejection maintained.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-**

Art Unit: 2673

MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David L. Le'-vis whose telephone number is (703) 306-3026. The examiner can normally be reached on MT and THF from 8 to 5. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala, can be reached on (703) 305-4938. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)
Hand-delivered responses should be brought to
Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA,
Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600